



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VIII.—“FREE” AND “CHECKED” VOWELS IN GALLIC POPULAR LATIN.

My reason for offering the present contribution to a subject no longer considered as affording opportunities for remarkable discoveries is the following: Among the characteristic terms employed by students of Old French philology there are two which, consecrated by long usage, occur more frequently, probably, than any others. These two are “free” (*frei, libre*) and “checked” (*gedeckt, entravé*); they are used to refer to the position of vowels in Popular Latin, the vowel being called “free” when standing before a single consonant or certain consonant combinations, “checked” in other circumstances. Now I dare say that there is no definition of such fundamental importance which betrays more inconsistencies and difficulties to the careful scholar than does this one as stated in its present form in the various manuals on Old French. After seeking in vain either to find any single definition that seemed satisfactory or to combine the statements of different scholars into one comprehensive presentation of the point in question, I concluded that there must be something radically wrong with the traditional method of expressing the definition, and determined to make an independent investigation of the whole matter.

Before entering upon this discussion I may be allowed to call attention to a point of secondary importance so far as the subject of the accompanying essay is involved, but which, I hope, is not without its value. An experience of two years lecturing on Old French phonology has led me to believe that there should be some method of presenting the developments of the vowels as a whole in a way more logical than that usually adopted in works on French. In scrutinizing the history of the derivation of the French language from the Popular Latin, the critical eye will observe that the prominent

principles which stand out as determining that development can be reduced in number to four or five. If we can grasp these principles and group all the vowel developments within or about them, we will have, instead of a medley of detached facts, a coherent system of scientific value. As the investigation of the question of free and checked position involves a study of all the vowels, I have, in presenting the results of this study, attempted to group them in the manner just suggested so that they will exhibit at once what may be considered the salient features of the vowel developments.

The essential difference between my plan of arriving at a definition of free and checked position and that of others who have approached the problem is this: Considering the two ends of the line of development having its starting point in Popular Latin and culminating in French, former students have based their definitions solely on the forms of the Popular Latin words, saying that the vowel was free when followed there by one consonant, or by two consonants, the last of which was L or R, etc.; when the French representative of the given word did not seem to conform to the definition, the French word was treated as exceptional. To illustrate this method, I note, for example, in Schwan:¹ "Free vowels are those . . . followed by a single consonant—TALE, MANU." Now the French derivative of TALE is *tel*, of MANU, *main*; surely the A was not free in the same sense in each of the Popular Latin etyma. Again, Paris says:² "I mean by checked vowels those . . . followed by the groups CR, GR, . . . those followed by two consonants of which one of the elements is a J." Now by the side of MACREM > *maigre*, PALATIUM > *palais*, we find INTEGRUM (> *entier*) > *entir*, PRETIUM (> *prieis*) > *pris*. If CR, TJ constituted checked position, why is not Ē checked before them as well as A? According to these definitions A is free whether its French derivative is *e* or *ai*; or Ē is checked when it develops *ie* before a palatal, free when it develops the same

¹*Grammatik des Altfranzösischen*, 2nd edition, § 55.

²*Romania*, x, 37.

before a single consonant, as $\text{PEDEM} > \text{pied}$. It seems to me that when we consider these (and other) inconsistencies which inevitably arise upon a reading of similar definitions, the desire must be felt to reduce the terms "free" and "checked" so that they shall each refer to one particular development of every vowel; otherwise an unfortunate confusion must result.

I begin at the opposite end of the above mentioned line, that is, with the French, and study the actual forms of the words there found, ascertaining if their development is regular according to known phonetic laws. I find by thus classifying their French derivatives that the Popular Latin vowels may be divided into three comprehensive classes; in the first they develop, in the second they remain, in the third they form diphthongs with palatal *i*. I endeavor to show that the third class represents a secondary development not to be confounded with that of the first class. This leaves but two classes to be considered, the first and second, which I call, respectively, free and checked. Now I group the words of the two classes and am able to formulate statements that the Popular Latin etyma of the vowels of the words were free or checked, according as they did or did not develop in French. This plan, in general terms, is to study results and judge from them of causes; the advantage of it I hope to make obvious in the following pages.

If we consider Gallic Popular Latin vowels as a whole, their history in French is the following:

I. In certain circumstances they develop: $\text{A} > e$; $\text{E} > ei > oi$; $\text{E} > ie$; $\text{O} > ou > eu$; $\text{Q} > uo > ue > eu$.¹

II. In other circumstances; that is, in all cases not to be considered under I and III, they retain their original forms: *A* remains as *a*, *E* and *e* as *e*, *O* as *o* (later *ou*), *Q* as *o*.

III. When before certain palatal consonants or combinations an *i* is developed after the accented vowel, we have to distinguish the following cases:

¹*I* and *u* maintain their original forms under all circumstances, and consequently are of no assistance in a consideration of the present topic. They will be spoken of only in my conclusions. Cf. p. 333.

1. Before the consonant or consonant group out of which the *i* develops, certain vowels develop as in I.

2. Before the same elements other vowels (than those in III, 1) lose their value as independent products; that is, they do not develop as in I, but instead form with the *i* diphthongs; the posterior evolution of such combinations is, therefore, that of the diphthong and not that of the vowel except secondarily.

3. Before some palatal combinations certain vowels do not even unite with the *i* to form diphthongs, but remain as in II.

It may be observed that III, 1 and 3 are but modifications of I and II respectively, and might well be included in the latter. This reduces the divisions of the vowels to three general classes, as already stated (that is, I, II and III, 2). In my summing up of results, I treat of these three as inclusive of all, but in the body of the paper I assign separate sections to III, 1 and 3.

I shall now give my examples of these various phenomena in the order indicated, and afterward, from a consideration of the whole, deduce some statements which may contribute toward solving the question of free and checked position.

I.

The vowels show the developments indicated in I above in the following cases:

1. When the vowel is in hiatus or is final: ME \dot{A} > *moie*,¹ V \dot{I} A > *voie*, SE \dot{A} T² > *soit*; DE \dot{U} S > *dieus*,³ ME \dot{U} S > *mieus*, ME \dot{U} M > *mieon* > *mien*,⁴ FEH(U) \dot{O} D > *fieu*; T \dot{U} A > *teue*, S \dot{U} A

¹ For the quality of the \dot{E} , cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des Langues Romanes*, I, 246.

² For this form, cf. Schwan, *Gram.*, §§ 40, 65 and 534, 2; Körting, *Der Formenbau des Französischen Verbums*, p. 239.

³ For the interchange of *-ieu*, *-iu* and *-eu* in Old French, cf. Suchier, *Altfranzösische Grammatik*, p. 54. Havet, in *Romania*, III, 332, says that because *deu* assonances with *e*, *deu* must be <*dieu* and not *vice versa*.

⁴ Cf. *Romania*, VII, 593.

> *seue*.¹ *Die* < DĪEM, *strie* < STRĪAM,² and *quia*³ are learned. ME > *moi*, TE > *toi*.

2. When the vowel is followed by a single consonant not a palatal, nor N or M.⁴

a. In monosyllables: TRAS > *tres*, TRĒS > *trois*; RĒM > *rien*, MĒL > *miel*; QQR > *cuer*.

b. Or in polysyllables, when the vowel is followed directly in the word by the consonant ("In the word" is employed in order to avoid the following possible confusion: if we divide such words as MIT-TAT, VAL-LEM, POR-TARE into syllables,⁵ the accented I, A and O are followed in the syllable by one consonant only, and yet they are checked): QUARE > *quer*, MALUM > *mel*;⁶ TALEM > *tel*; MENSEM > *mois*; PEDEM > *pied*; HONOREM > *honneur*; NQVUM > *nuef* > *neuf*.

3. When the vowel is followed by two consonants, the first of which is not a palatal,⁴ nasal nor L or R,⁷ and the second of which is:

a. R: PATREM > *pere*, LABRUM > *lèvre*, CAPRAM > *chevre*, FABRUM > *fèvre*; VĒTRUM > *voire*, PĪPEREM > *poivre*; PE-TRAM > *pierre*, DERĒTRO > *derrière*, HĒDERAM > *lierre*, PALPE-TRAM > *paupière*, LEPRAM > *liepre*, FĒBREM > *fièvre*, CATHĒDRAM > *chaière*,⁸ TENĒBRAS > *teniebres*; BŪTYRUM >

¹ Cf. *Romania*, x, 40.

² These words keep Latin *i* in Italian also; cf. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, VIII, 180-181.

³ Cf. *Romania*, ix, 126.

⁴ In which cases the results are different for A, E and O, as will be explained under III, 2, cf. pp. 319 and 324; results are the same, however, for E and O, as is noted under I, 4, p. 314, and III, 1, p. 315.

⁵ Cf. Seelmann, *Die Aussprache des Latein*, pp. 139 and 149.

⁶ For *mal*, *car*, etc., cf. Schwan, *Gram.*, § 75. *Ja* and *estas* are probably latinisms.

⁷ LL, RR, RL, LR constitute checked position: VALLEM > *val*, TERRAM > *terre*, CAROLUS > *Charles*, *PERLAM > *perle*; between L and R a *d* is intercalated in French: COLERE > *colre* > *coldre*. The same insertion of *d* takes place in the case of MR, SR, etc. Cf. Schwan, *Gram.*, §§ 230, 4; Gutheim, *Ueber Konsonanten-Assimilation im Französischen*, p. 88; Passy, *Étude sur les Changements Phonétiques*, § 534.

⁸ Cf. *Gram. d. lang. rom.*, I, 445.

beurre; *COLQBRAM > *couluevre*.¹ The following words are exceptions to this development; most of them are of learned formation: *candelabre*, *cadre*, *théâtre*; *mezre* < MĪSERA,² *frepe* < FĪBRAM, *tigre*; *cèdre*, *celèbre*, *pyrèthre*; ³ *lucre*, *lugubre*, *sobre*.⁴

b. L: FLĒBILEM > *fleible* > *foible*, IN + DEBILEM > *endeible*; EBULUM > *ieble*,⁵ NEBULAM > *nieule*,⁶ SAECULUM > *siecle*; POPULUM > *peuple*; PQPULUM > *puople*⁷ > *pueple*, *ABQCU-LUM > *avuegle*.⁸

These examples (3, b) are numerous enough, I think, to justify placing L by the side of R as not checking the development of the preceding vowel when the L is the second of two consonants. Schwan does not specify consonant + L in his statement of what constitutes free position.⁹ He made this omission probably because of the many varying developments of this combination itself. In view of this omission, it may be well to note some of the prominent opinions as to these developments. In the first place I shall speak of the development of PL, BL themselves; and in the second place of the separate vowels before these combinations.

On the development of PL, BL, Schwan speaks as follows: ¹⁰ "When P comes before L as the result of the fall (in Popular Latin) of an intermediate vowel, it (P) remains; original Latin PL > *bl*; compare COPULAM > *couple*, DUPLUM > *double*."

¹ For the change of ť to ǔ in this word, cf. Havet in *Romania*, vi, 433-436. His explanation is not accepted in all particulars by Paris in *Ibid.*, x, 49, f. n. 4.

² Cf. Körting, *Wörterbuch*, No. 5338.

³ Cf. Körting, *Wtb.*, No. 6508.

⁴ *Loutre* is < LUTTRA not LUTRA; cf. *Romania*, x, 42.

⁵ Cf. Suchier, *Gram.*, p. 43.

⁶ Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 55.

⁷ *Saint Leger*, 90.

⁸ In SAECULUM, *ABOCULUM the consonant before L is a palatal, but does not develop as palatals usually do, hence the words are half learned. The ē and o in them diphthongize, however, and therefore I place them here. Regularly the French derivatives would be **steil*, **avueil*; cf. *Romania*, xviii, 157.

⁹ *Gram.*, § 55, 2.

¹⁰ *Gram.*, § 167.

Gutheim says:¹ "Original PL > *bl*; Romance P'L develops differently according to the time of the syncopation of the (originally) intervening vowel: it (P'L) > *bl*, which stage is seen in Old French; while in Modern French *pl* has been reëstablished under Latin influence: POPULUM > O. F. *poble*, M. F. *peuple*; B'L (< P'L) > *ul*: STUPULAM > *êteule*." Meyer-Lübke states:² "In France PL > *bl*; BL persists except in cases in which it had become *ul* already in Popular Latin." Again:³ "The treatment of PL and of BL is not quite clear; by the side of *double*, *treble*, we find *couple*, *pueple* (*pueble* also, however, in Parisian records of the XIV century), and by the side of *râble* < ROTABULUM, one meets *fondêfle* < FUNDIBULUM and *ensouple* < INSUBULUM."

On the development of various vowels before consonant + L we note the following:

A + BL. TAB(U)LAM; here the B > *u* with which *u* the *a* combines immediately (picard *taule*⁴) developing in Ile-de-France > *o* (just as original Popular Latin AU > *o*⁵), *tôle*. Similarly PARABOLAM > *parole*. This is considered as the regular development of A + BL by most scholars, who consequently look upon such words as *cable*, *fable*, *étable*, *diable* as learned.⁶ Horning alone, I think, speaks of the latter set of words as being the regular Ile-de-France forms.⁷

Ē + BL. As variants of *foible*, *endeible*, both *fieble* and *endieble* occur.⁸ Schwan says that in the two latter words Ē > Ē under the influence of the following labial.⁹ Meyer-Lübke says they are peculiar to the Norman.¹⁰ *Terrible* is learned;

¹ *Konsonant.-Assim.*, p. 69.

² *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 439.

³ *Ibid.*, I, 442.

⁴ Cf. Neumann, *Zur Laut- und Flexions-lehre des Altfranzösischen*, p. 110.

⁵ Cf. Schwan, *Gram.*, § 108.

⁶ Cf. Schwan, *Gram.*, § 75, 2; Gutheim, *Konsonant.-Assim.*, p. 71; Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 230.

⁷ Cf. Bartsch et Horning, *La Langue et la Littérature Françaises*, p. 39, § 158.

⁸ Cf. Suchier, *Gram.*, p. 49; Paris, *L'Accent Latin*, p. 97.

⁹ *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, XII, 197.

¹⁰ *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 125.

fondêfle < FONDIBULUM belongs to a class of words which, in Romance, show *f* for Latin *B*.¹

Ē + consonant (other than *B*) + *L*. For Ē + *GL* (where the *G* has not developed as a palatal) we have *REGULAM* and *TEGULAM*. The early representatives of these are *reule*, *teule*. Meyer-Lübke² and Gutheim³ suppose the *G* to have fallen on account of the labializing influence of the *U*. Schwan⁴ considers *teule* and *reule* as learned, saying that the popular forms of the words must have been *TEGLA*, *REGLA* (ital. *tegghia*, span. *teja*, portg. *telha*). *Tieule*, *rieule* occur also; Suchier suggests for *rieule* the influence of the Ē of *REGO*.⁵

Q + *PL*, *BL*. *Ou* in *couple*, *double* did not develop further > *eu*; the *ou* was probably kept by analogy to that occurring in pretonic position in the verbs *coupler*, *doubler* (cf. *époux*, *avoue*, formed on *épouser*, *avouer*);⁶ *noble* < *NOBILEM* is learned;⁷ *mueble* < *MOBILEM* appears to be anomalous; for it we have two suggestions: Förster supposes⁸ that out of original *MÖVIBLEM* a Popular Latin *MQVBILEM* may have been formed by the side of *MOBILEM*. Neumann⁹ attributes the *Q* to the influence of verb forms of *MQVERE* (such as *muet*, *muevent*, etc.). For *STÛPULAM* we have the variants *estouble*, *estoule*, *esteule*.¹⁰ There is a question as to the confusion of *STÛPULAM* and *STĪPULAM*.¹¹

¹ For which cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 42, § 19; *Italienische Grammatik*, § 11; Gutheim, *Konson.-Assim.*, p. 71, and especially Ascoli in *Archivio Glottologico Italiano*, x, 1-17.

² *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 480.

³ *Konson.-Assim.*, p. 58.

⁴ *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, XII, 207.

⁵ *Gram.*, p. 55. For the later forms of the words, *riule*, *ruile*, *tiule*, *tuile*, cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 116; *règle* is evidently learned; for *reille* cf. this paper, III, 3, p. 325.

⁶ Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 134; Bartsch et Horning, *La Langue*, etc., § 72; *Romunia*, x, 42.

⁷ Cf. Suchier, *Gram.*, p. 16.

⁸ *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, III, 562.

⁹ *Laut- und Flex.*, p. 48.

¹⁰ Cf. Körting, *Wtb.*, No. 7779.

¹¹ For the discussion cf. Marchesini in *Studj di Filologia Romanza*, II, 3; Meyer-Lübke in *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, XI, 578; Paris in *Romania*, XIX, 124; Mackel, *Die Germanischen Elemente in der Französischen und Provençalischen Sprache*, p. 24.

Q + TL. As derivatives of RQTULUM, MQDULUM we find *rodle, role, modle, mo(u)le*. Gröber says these belong to a class of words which were taken into French at a late date, as is shown by the fact that in them TL was not confounded with CL.¹

The above represents, probably, the most important data on the history of the vowels before two consonants, the last of which is L, and, in view of it all, I think I am justified in specifying consonants + L as not constituting a check to the development of the vowels.

We have now to note several cases in which E and Q show a development of which the other vowels do not partake. Because this development (> *ie, ue*) is the same as that which E and Q undergo under the circumstances noted in 1, 2, 3 (I), it is not necessary to assign a separate section to them here, but we may consider these developments as continuations of our previous series (1, 2, 3).

E and Q > *ie* and *ue*.

4. Before single M and N: BENE > *bien*, REM > *rien*; HQMO > *huem*, QMES > *cuens*, BQNUM > *buen*, SQNUM > *suen*.²

5. Before LJ (*l mouillée*): VECLUM > *vieil*; FQLIAM > *feuille*, *DQLIUM > *deuil*, QCULUM > *ueil*, *SCQCULUM > *écueil*. SAEULUM and *ABOCULUM, which develop irregularly, have been treated already.³ Irregular are also *DESPQLIUM > *dépouille*, QLEUM > *uile*; *dépouille* is probably analogical to the pretonic *ou* in *dépouiller*.⁴ The palatalization of the L of OLEUM disappeared in the representatives of the word in nearly the whole Romance field.⁵

¹Archiv für Lateinische Lexicographie, I, 245.

²There is some question as to this development for Q in Ile-de-France. Cf. Suchier, *Gram.*, pp. 64 and 73, where he claims it for this territory also. Schwan gives it for Q + M but doubts it for Q + N; cf. his *Gram.*, § 102, 2.

³Cf. this paper, I, 3, b, p. 311.

⁴Cf. *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, XII, 194.

⁵Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 468 and 268. For dialect forms of OLEUM cf. Matzke, *Dialectische Eigenthümlichkeiten in der Entwicklung des Mouillierten L im Altfranzösischen*, p. 92.

6. Before *vj* (examples for *ɛ* only): *LĒVIUS* > *liège*, *TRĒVIUM* > *triège*.¹

II.

In all circumstances not specified under I (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), nor in III (1, 2) below, the vowels do not develop at all, retaining their original forms (with the exception of *o* which becomes *ou*); before *N* or *M* + a consonant the vowels become nasalized: *VALLEM* > *val*, *CAR(O)LUS* > *Charles*, *QUANTUM* > *quant*; *VĪRIDEM* > *vert*, *CLĒRICUM* > *clerc*, *TRĒNTA* > *trēnte*; **PĒRLAM* > *perle*, *TĒRRAM* > *terre*, *SĒPTĒM* > *sept*, *VĒNTUM* > *vēnt*; (*COHORTEM* >) *CQRTĒM* > *cort* > *court*, *DIŪRNUM* > *jor* > *jour*, *UMBRAM* > *ōmbre*; *PQRTAM* > *porte*, *GRQSSUM* > *gros*, *CQMPUTUM* > *cōnte*.

III.

In this division we have to consider those cases in which the vowels occur before simple palatals or palatal groups.

1. Before such elements *ɛ* and *o* diphthongize (as in I), forming with the palatal *i* the triphthongs *iei* and (*uoi* >) *uei*, which are at once reduced to *-i* and *-ui* respectively by the fall of the medial vowels.²

Examples for *ɛ*.

a. Before simple palatal, or palatal + consonant: *PRĒCAT* > *prie*, *DECEM* > *dis*, *LĒCTUM* > *lit*, *SĒX* > *sis*, *INTEGRUM* > *entire*, *ALĒCRUM* > *aligre*.³

b. Before *TJ*: *PRĒTIUM* > *pris*.

¹ Cf. Körting, *Wtb.*, Nos. 4776 and 8383; also *Romania*, v, 68.

² Cf. Schwan, *Gram.*, § 56, *anm*; Bartsch et Horning, *La Langue*, etc., § 63; Suchier, in *Gram.*, § 33, in *Le Français Et Le Provençal*, p. 85, in *Grundriss der Romanischen Philologie* (Gröber), I, 601.

³ For this word cf. *Grundriss*, I, 361, § 15; Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 224, *Ital. Gram.*, § 50; Förster, *Romanische Studien*, IV, 53; Waldner, *Die Quellen des Parasitischen I im Altfranzösischen*, p. 19.

c. Before DJ: MEDIUM > *mi*.

d. Before NJ: ARMENIUM > *armin*, CONVENIUM > *convin*, INGENIUM > *engin*, SENIOR > *sire*. The development of $\text{E} + \text{NJ}$ is stated by Schwan¹ and Horning² to be *ien'* (ex. VENIAM > *vienge*), although Horning in another place³ mentions $\text{E} + \text{NJ} > \text{in'}$ (without specifying the stage *iei*, however). Suchier, speaking of *sire*, says it has *i* on account of the N of SENIOR,⁴ but afterward⁵ he mentions the combination *iein* and says it developed out of $\text{E} + \text{NJ}$ when the *n'* was followed by a consonant. The last part of this statement ("followed by a consonant") must not be misunderstood; if I interpret it correctly it does not mean that the combination (*iei*) might not develop also before *n'* followed by a vowel, but that in this case the palatalization of the *n* would remain and absorb the *i* immediately, so that no triphthong would be formed; whereas when the *n'* was followed by a consonant the palatalization of the *n* was lost, the *i* was therefore not absorbed, and the result was *iei* > *i*. Hence the Old French nominative of INGENIUM would be (*engiein's* > *engieinz* >) *enginz*, the accusative (*engiein'* >) *engien'*. Such an understanding of this development will render the meaning of the statements of the above scholars the same. Waldner⁶ and Förster⁷ both give $\text{ENJ} > \text{iein'} > \text{in'}$.

e. Before RJ: IMPERIUM > *empire*, MATERIAM > *matire*.⁸ Irregular are MINISTERIUM > *mestier*, MISERIAM > *misère*, REFUGERIUM > *rifugère*.

f. Before SJ: ECCLESIAM > *église*, CERESIAM > *cerise*, VINESIAM > *Venise*.⁹

¹ *Gram.*, § 91, 2.

² Bartsch et Horning, *La Langue*, etc., § 32.

³ *Zur Geschichte des Lateinischen c vor e und i im Romanischen*, p. 22.

⁴ *Gram.*, p. 27.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 75, § 49.

⁶ *Parasit. I*, p. 31.

⁷ *Zu. f. Rom. Phil.*, III, 502.

⁸ Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 472; Bartsch et Horning, *La Langue*, etc., § 21.

⁹ For statements as to the open quality of the accented vowel of these words, and its development > *iei* > *i*, cf. *Grundriss*, I, 361, § 15; 500, § 12; 524, § 48; Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 32 and 244, *Ital. Gram.*, § 50;

The development of $\text{ɛ} + \text{KJ}$ is a disputed point. The examples I note are $\text{SPECIEM} > \text{épice}$, $\text{GRAECIAM} > \text{Grice}$, $\text{GALLAECIAM} > \text{Gallice}$. Comparing these words with others containing accented vowel + palatal combination, the two explanations which suggest themselves for them are: First, that the original accented ɛ was raised to $(\text{ɛ} >) i$ under the influence of the following I ; this would probably be extending Förster's law (of umlaut) too far. The second explanation would be that a palatal i developed from the KJ and formed with the $ie < \text{ɛ}$ the triphthong iei which was at once reduced to i ; this seems hazardous because KJ is not supposed to have developed an i . Nevertheless one must think that, by the working of some (as yet) unknown law, such may have been the case. Meyer-Lübke hints at it.¹ Horning makes the bald statement " $\text{E} + \text{CY}$ becomes i "² and does not revert to the development afterward. Suchier³ and Schwan⁴ simply mention the words as exceptional.

Examples for Q .⁵

a. Before simple palatal or palatal + consonant: $\text{DQCET} > \text{duist}$, $\text{NQCTEM} > \text{nuît}$, $\text{CQXAM} > \text{cuisse}$, $\text{NQCERE} > \text{nuire}$.

b. Before DJ : $\text{HQDIE} > \text{hui}$, $*\text{INQDIUM} > \text{ennui}$, $\text{MQDIUM} > \text{muid}$, $\text{PQDIUM} > \text{pui}$.

c. Before GJ : $\text{RQGIUM} > \text{rui}$. Irregular are $\text{HOROLQGIUM} > \text{horloge}$, $\text{ELQGIUM} > \text{éloge}$.

Thomsen, *Romania*, v, 67; Canello, *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, I, 511; Förster, *ibid.*, III, 502 and 513; Schwan, *ibid.*, XII, 194; Horning, *Lat. c.*, p. 22; Suchier, *Gram.*, p. 61. For $\text{CL} > \text{GL}$ in *église* cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 442.

¹ *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 158.

² *Lat. c.*, p. 22; Bartsch et Horning, *La Langue*, etc., p. 12, § 32.

³ *Gram.*, p. 27.

⁴ *Gram.*, § 92.

⁵ On the development of $\text{Q} > (\text{uoi} > \text{uei}) > \text{ui}$, cf. the references given in foot-note to III, I, p. 315. Havet in *Romania*, III, 336, ss., supposed that for qi to become ui it passed through the stages öi , oi . Schuchardt in *ibid.*, IV, 119, proposed $\text{qi} > \text{uoi} > \text{ui}$. Thomsen adopted this development in *ibid.*, v, 64 and 74; cf. *ibid.*, XI, 605.

d. Before RJ: CQRIUM > *cuir*. Irregular are FQRIAM > *foire*, HISTQRIAM > *histoire*, MEMQRIAM > *mémoire*, *PQRIUM > *poire*, TRIFQRIUM > *trifaire*. Such words as these just mentioned were taken originally into the language in the learned forms *historie*, *memorie*, *glorie*, etc., and retained these forms as late as the twelfth century; at this date the old law for the palatalisation of the *r* and the development of an *i* before it became active again, and *histoire*, *mémoire*, etc., resulted. This was centuries after the development of Popular Latin Q + RJ > *ueir*, *uir*, and the new *oir* (of the twelfth century) was therefore not subject to that development.¹

e. Before NJ: LQNGE + S > *lueinz* > *luinz*, CQGNITUM > *cueinte* > *cuinte*.² There are some reservations to be made as to this section. It is not a settled point whether the regular development of Q + dental N is *ue* or *ō*; we find both in Old French Texts.³ Our examples seem to show that, if Suchier is right in supposing a development of Q + NJ > *uei* > *ui*, there exists a similar two-sided development in the case of Q + palatal N, since with *luign* and *cuinte* we find *soin* < SQNIUM⁴ and *espoine* < SPQNEUM, where, in the last two examples, Q has become *ō* and developed like the latter.⁵

Granting that *luin*, *cuinte* are not < *uein* but variants of *loin*, *cointe*,⁶ we can easily explain the apparent divergence here in the history (otherwise similar in cases noted above⁷) of *ē* and Q before NJ. As we have just noted, if Q before this combination does not diphthongize, it > *ō*,⁸ and develops as this latter

¹ Cf. Waldner, *Parasit. I*, p. 32; Havet in *Romania*, III, 336; Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 290.

² Cf. Suchier, *Gram.*, pp. 64, § 35 and 75, § 48.

³ Cf. Bartsch et Horning, *La Langue*, etc., § 62; this paper, I, 4, p. 314.

⁴ Mackel in *Germ. Elem.*, p. 21, says *essoigne* is < German *sūnja* and that *soin* is formed on *soignier*.

⁵ Cf. Schwan, *Gram.*, § 101.

⁶ Cf. Bartsch et Horning, *La Langue*, etc., § 64; Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 204, *Ital. Gram.*, § 66.

⁷ Cf. III, 1 throughout.

⁸ Cf. Suchier, *Fr. et Prov.*, p. 31, *Grundriss*, I, 576.

does. On the other hand the nasalization of the diphthong *ie* ($< \text{ɛ} + \text{Ń}$) was very late¹ and nothing, therefore, prevented its junction with the palatal *i* ($< \text{Ńj}$) to form the triphthong *iei*.

2. A, ɛ and o form with the palatal *i* the diphthongs *ai*, *ei* and *oi*, the subsequent evolution of which is the same as that of any other *ai*, *ei* and *oi* in the language (that is, *ai*, etc., derived from a combination other than A, etc., + palatal).

ai develops from

a. A + a single palatal or palatal + a consonant: BRACAM $>$ *braie*, MAGIS $>$ *mais*, LAXAT $>$ *laisse*, FACERE $>$ *faire*,² TRAGERE $>$ *traire*, PLACERE $>$ *plaire*.³ On account of the incomplete development of their consonants *maigre* $<$ MACREM and *aigre* $<$ ACREM may be considered half-learned.⁴ Meyer-Lübke⁵ and Gutheim⁶ make the statement that *ai* (in these last two words, at least) is a phonetic representation of ɛ and is therefore not to be considered a diphthong. The former scholar seems to base such an understanding of the point on the fact that the Lorraine dialect replaces the *ai* of these words by ɛ . This would not necessarily prove anything, however, with regard to the corresponding Ile-de-France forms. The Lorraine shows *e* as the development of A + R + consonant also (BARBAM $>$ *berb*) and, on the other hand, *a* as a development of E + L + consonant (BELLUM $>$ *bal*), but these phenomena indicate nothing with regard to the history of the same vowels in the Ile-de-France. On such a principle we might conclude that *ai* of *travail*, *entrailles* was pronounced as ɛ in Old French of Ile-de-France, since in a Lorraine text we find written *traveil*, *entreilles*.⁷ We must remember, in our

¹ Cf. Darmesteter, *Grammaire Historique de la Langue Française*, 1^{ère} Partie, *Phonétique*, p. 133; Suchier, *Gram.*, p. 68, § 40.

² For a résumé of the discussions on the development of this form, cf. Rydberg, *Le Développement de FACERE dans les Langues Romanes*, p. 33.

³ *Plaire* and *taire* may be later than *plaisir*, *taisir*. Cf. Suchier, *Fr. et Prov.*, p. 104, *Grundriss*, I, 610.

⁴ *Aigle* and *alaigne* should probably be classed here also.

⁵ *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 210.

⁶ *Konson-Assim.*, p. 54.

⁷ Cf. Matzke, *Moul. L.*, p. 68.

present discussion, that from the earliest stages of Ile-de-France French we find the development of $A > e$ written as e . In cases where a development of A is not so represented in writing, then, very strong reasons must be given before we can be sure that this development was ϵ , although not so written. The ai of which we are now treating does become ϵ in pronunciation, and sporadically in writing,¹ but this secondary ϵ is a late product and out of the French diphthong ai ,² and is not to be confounded with the original developments which have been demanding our attention. Beside this, the fact that the old theory has been exploded that A passed through an $*ai$ stage to arrive at e ,³ this fact would seem to mitigate against considering ai as a phonetic representation of e at an early stage of the language.

b. $A + TJ$: $*CALATIUM > calais$, $PALATIUM > palais$, $MALVATIUM > mauvais$,⁴ $*BELLATIUM > belais$.⁵ The development of TJ is a disputed point. Because words like $GRATIUM$, $PLATEAM$, $*PRAEFATIUM$, $*MATEAM$ become *grace*, *place*, *préface*, *mace*, the rule is sometimes stated: $TJA > ts$ (written c), $TJ +$ any other vowel (that is TJ final) as in the first set of examples, $> is$. Mussafia thinks the development of TJ is always is ⁶ and, together with Suchier,⁷ Paris⁶ and Schwan,⁸ supposes for *grace*, *place*, etc., etyma with TT ($GRATTIAM$). Such is my authority for giving the development as I have done.⁹

¹ Cf. Rydberg, *Dével. de FACERE*, p. 32.

² Cf. Marchot, *Solution de quelques Difficultés de la Phonétique Française*, p. 33; Suchier, *Fr. et Prov.*, p. 43, § 13, *Grundriss*, I, 582, *Gram.*, p. 39; Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 221.

³ Cf. Ten Brink, *Dauer und Klang*, pp. 15-19.

⁴ For this etymology cf. Bugge in *Romania*, IV, 367. Schuchardt, in *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, XIV, 183, posits for Old French *malves*, (ϵ) a $*MALIFATUS$, forming the latter upon the model of a $BONIFATUS$, an example of which he cites.

⁵ Cf. *Romania*, XVIII, 534.

⁶ Cf. *Romania*, XVIII, 551.

⁷ *Fr. et Prov.*, p. 148, *Grundriss*, I, 631, § 70.

⁸ *Gram.*, § 251, 2, anm. 2.

⁹ The last scholar to discuss the point is Horning, in *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, XVIII, 232-242. His article does not seem to me conclusive. The word *abaye* < $ABBATIUM$, not mentioned in any of the above discussions, is probably a formation on forms like *foleie*.

c. A + DJ: BADIUM > *bai*, RADIUM > *rai*.

d. A + GJ: EXAGIUM > *essai*, *PLAGIAM > *plaie*. Irregular are AQUAGIUM > *ouaiche*, *PEDAGIUM > *péage*.

e. A + RJ: AREAM > *aire*, *HARJAM > *haire*, VARIUM > *vair*, *DOTARIUM > *douaire*, SAGITTARIUM > *sagittaire*.¹

ei (later *oi*) develops from

a. ɛ + single palatal, or palatal + consonant: VĪCEM > *feiz* > *fois*, DIRĒCTUM > *dreit* > *droit*, LĪCERE > *loire*, NĪGRUM > *noir*.

b. ɛ + GJ: CORRĪGIAM > *corroie*, PHRŸGIUM > *freis*.² NAVĪGIUM > *navire* is irregular.

c. ɛ + RJ: FĒRIAM > *foire*.³ This is the only example I have noted for ɛ + RJ > *oi*; CĒREUM > *cirge* (probably on analogy to *cire*⁴); *TŸRIUM > *tire*, MARTŸRIUM > *martire* (Suchier attributes to the atonic *i* the power to keep the tonic *i* of these two words⁵). The suffix -ĒRIUM, -ĒRIAM shows derivatives in -ier: CANTĒRIUM > *chantier*, and in -ère: PRESBYTĒRIUM > *presbytère* (words like the latter are learned). We are here in the presence of interchange of suffixes.⁶

d. ɛ + SJ: ARDESIAM > *ardoise*, ARTEMĪSIAM > *armoise*, CARCHESIUM > *carquois*, CEREVĪSIAM > *cervoise*. Irregular are TAMĪSIUM > *tamis*, CAMĪSIAM⁷ > *chemise*.

¹ Developments of the suffix -ARIUM are not mentioned here since they are irregular and, up to the present, not satisfactorily explained. A résumé of the state of the entire question, and a suggestion of a new solution were given by Marchot in *Solution*, etc., pp. 11-32 (his own explanation being republished in *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, xvii, 288). Meyer-Lübke in *Literaturblatt für Germ. und Roman. Phil.*, 1894, pp. 11-13, pronounces Marchot's explanation a failure. Marchot returns to the question in *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, xix, 61-70.

² Cf. Suchier, *Gram.*, p. 49, 4.

³ Cf. *Romania*, v, 67.

⁴ Cf. *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, xii, 197.

⁵ *Gram.*, p. 26.

⁶ Cf. Cohn, *Die Suffixwandlungen im Vulgärlatein*, pp. 285-291.

⁷ Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, i, 122, says the quantity of the tonic *i* of this word is uncertain. Suchier explains the retention of the first *i* by the influence of the second. Cf. his *Gram.*, p. 26.

e. $\text{Ē} + \text{DJ} : \text{ANTEA} + \text{ĪDIUS} > \text{anceis} > \text{aņçois}$, $\text{FORTĪDIUS} > \text{forceis}$, $\text{SORDĪDIUS} > \text{sordeis}$.¹ Schuchardt proposed² in the place of ANTE IPSUM (which, for a long time, was supposed to be the etymon of *anceis*³) an *ANTJIDIUS and for *forceis* a FORTJIDIUS , deriving the TJ in these words from that existing in the forms ANTIOR , FORTIOR . Thomas⁴ supposed as the background of *aņçois* an ANTĪUS in which the U had fallen and Ī developed as usual ($> \text{Ē} > \text{ei} > \text{oi}$). I have noted no other examples for $\text{Ē} + \text{DJ}$; so far as the French shows it, the Ī of the Latin never became Ē in the following words: $\text{INVĪDIAM} > \text{envie}$, $\text{DIMĪDIUM} > \text{demi}$, $\text{AEGĪDIUS} > \text{Gilles}$ (*Gire*⁵).

f. $\text{Ē} + \text{TJA} : \text{PRODEM} + \text{ĪTIAM} > \text{proeise}$, German $\text{RĪKI} + \text{ĪTIAM} > \text{richeise}$. This is another disputed development; I give the above as the regular one, following Mussafia, Paris and Suchier, with whom Horning does not agree. The dispute arises on account of the varying reflexes of $-\text{ĪTIAM}$ in French, this suffix being represented by *-eise* (as just given),—by *-ice* ($\text{POLĪTIAM} > \text{police}$, $\text{MILĪTIAM} > \text{milice}$, $\text{JUSTĪTIAM} > \text{justice}$),—by *-ece*, *-esse*, ($\text{*JUVENĪTIAM} > \text{jeunesse}$, $\text{*LARGĪTIAM} > \text{largesse}$, $\text{TRISTĪTIAM} > \text{tristesse}$, $\text{MOLLITIAM} > \text{molesse}$, $\text{PIGRĪTIAM} > \text{paresse}$, $\text{VETULĪTIAM} > \text{vieillesse}$), and by *-ise* ($\text{*CUPIDĪTIAM} > \text{convoitise}$, $\text{*FRANKĪTIAM} > \text{franchise}$). Mussafia⁶ says *-ece* is $< -\text{ĪCIAM}$, *-ice* is the learned form for $-\text{ĪTIAM}$, *-ise* is not a crossing of $\begin{cases} -eise \\ -ice \end{cases}$ but $< -\text{ĪTIAM}$. Paris says *-ice*

and *-ise* are variants of each other. Muret offers what is probably the best explanation for *-ise*: it developed $< -\text{ĪTIAM}$ when this suffix was preceded by a palatal ($-\text{e}^i\text{ise} > -\text{ise}$, as *franchise*) and was afterward extended to words whose consonant preceding the suffix was not a palatal.⁷

¹ Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, II, 93.

² *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, xv, 240.

³ Cf., for example, *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, vi, 264.

⁴ *Romania*, xiv, 575; cf. *ibid.*, xvii, 95.

⁵ Cf. *Romania*, vi, 133; Suchier, *Gram.*, p. 26.

⁶ On this section, $\text{Ē} + \text{TJ}$, cf. references given in III, 2, b, A + TJ, p. 320, and in addition, Suchier, *Gram.*, p. 26.

⁷ Cf. *Romania*, xix, 592.

For -ĪTIUM we find *-ice* (SERVĪTIUM > *service*, VĪTIUM > *vice*, NOVĪTIUM > *novice*, HOSPĪTIUM > *hospice*) and *-is* (SUPERPELLĪTIUM > *surplis*). Mussafia considers the *-ice* as learned, *-is* as < -ĪTIUM, and the variant *-ise* as a crossing of

{ *-is* According to him *chevez* is < -ĒCJAM.
-ice.

oi develops from

a. Ǫ + simple palatal: VOCEM > *voiz*, CRUCEM > *croiz*.

b. Ǫ + RJ: CIBǪRIUM > *ciboire*, CISǪRIUM > *cisoire*, MIRATORIUM > *miroir*, PECTINǪRIUM > *peignoir*, SCRIPTǪRIUM > *écritoire*, TONSǪRIAM > *tezoire*.¹ Irregular are SAIMŪRIAM > *saumure*, SERǪRIUM > *serorge*, AGŪRIUM > *oür*.²

c. Ǫ > TJ: LŪTEUS > *lois*. Here we find varying developments again, as was the case with Ǽ + TJ; for example, *MŪTIUS > *mousse*, NEGŪTIUM > *negoce*, PŪTEUS > *puis*. Suchier³ gives *ui* as a regular development of ū before a consonant out of which a palatal *i* is developed. This rule would not include *lois*, however, nor words like *angoisse*, *froisset*, but only *puits*, which, for that matter, can be accounted for as formed on *puiser*.⁴ I give *oi* as the development of Ǫ + TJ, without, however, insisting upon it.

The only example I have noted for Ǫ + DJ is STUDIUM > *étude*, which is learned.⁵ The half learned *estuide* occurs also.⁶

Variations occur, again, in the derivatives of Ǫ + VJ; for example, FLŪVIUM (mod. *fleuve*)⁷ is represented by *fluive*, *fluvie*, *flueve* and *fluve*,⁸ DILŪVIUM (mod. *déluge*) by *deluive* and *de-*

¹ On this development cf. Waldner, *Parasit. I*, p. 29; Marchot, *Revue des Langues Romanes*, 1894, p. 182; Meyer, *Romania*, 1894, p. 611.

² Cf. Suchier, *Gram.*, p. 11.

³ *Gram.*, p. 34.

⁴ Cf. *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, xviii, 233. Curiously enough, Ascoli, in *Arch. Gtot. It.*, x, 84, says *puiser* is formed on *puits*!

⁵ Cf. Suchier, *Gram.*, p. 11; Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 147.

⁶ Cf. Bartsch et Horning, *La Langue*, etc., § 75; for *estuire* cf. *Romania*, vi, 129, 255.

⁷ Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 144.

⁸ Cf. *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, iii, 502.

luevre, PLŮVIAM by *pluie*. Suchier¹ announces as a principle the change of ɔ to ɔ̃ before labials and includes among illustrations of the change the words under discussion. For classic PLŮVIAM Meyer-Lübke posits a Popular Latin form *PLQJA.²

There should be mentioned here the diphthongs *ai*, *ei*, *oi*, which arise when A, ɛ and ɔ precede palatal *n*. The value of these diphthongs was different from that of *ai*, *ei*, *oi* before oral consonants, and hence they are not to be treated together. Before palatal *n* we have -*āin'*, -*ēin'*, -*ōin'*:³ PROPAGINEM > *provāin'*, SUBTERRANEUM > *souterrāin'*; INSĪGNAT > *ensēigne*, TĪNEA > *tēigne*, PŪGNUM > *pōin'*, TESTIMŌNIUM > *temōin'*. The subsequent development of the diphthongs is determined by the position of the *n'* as intervocalic or final. In the former case the palatal *i* is absorbed by the *n'*, in the latter, the palatalization of the *n* disappears entirely and *ai*, *ei* develop as when before simple *m* and *n*, *oi* as before oral consonants.⁴

The diphthongs *āi*, *ēi* arise also before single *m* and *n*, the *i* in this case being introduced as a glide element: MANUS > *main*, PLENUM > *plein*.⁵

3. In this section we are to treat of the vowels A, ɛ and ɔ before the palatal combination LJ (*l mouillée*). Before *l mouillée* we find an *i*, with which A, ɛ and ɔ do not unite to form diphthongs as in 2 above, but remain as in II. This *i* was not a palatal *i* (as in 2 above), being originally a mere graphic sign

¹ *Gram.*, pp. 40 and 58. Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 139, *It. Gram.*, §§ 58 and 78; Schwan, *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, XII, 197.

² *Grundriss*, I, 361, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 455, *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, x, 173.

³ Cf. *Romania*, XI, 605.

⁴ Cf. Waldner, *Parasit. I*, p. 21; Darmesteter, *Gram. Hist.*, p. 137. For irregularities in the developments cf. Waldner, *o. c.*, p. 32; Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 290; *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, xv, 522.

⁵ The date and the manner of the nasalization of the French vowels, the difference between *āi*, *ēi* and *ō* (<ɔ) are as yet open questions. Cf. Suchier, *Fr. et Prov.*, p. 31, *Grundriss*, I, 576, *Gram.*, p. 61. Some useful references may be found also in an article by Koschwitz in *Compte Rendu du Congrès Scientifique International des Catholiques* (Paris, 1891, Picard, Ed.), pp. 16-20.

(to denote the palatalization of the *l*, -ail being written to indicate the pronunciation of -al', -eil that of -el', etc.).

A + palatal L: ALIUM > *ail*, *ferrailiam > *ferraille*, MAL-LEUM > *mail*, PALEAM > *paille*, *VENTALIUM > *évantail*; CENACULUM > *cenail*, GUBERNACULUM > *gouvernail*, SERACULUM > *serail*, *TRABACULUM > *travail*; TRAGULAM > *traille*; RADULAM > *raille*. Forms like *miracle* < MIRACULUM, *spectacle* < SPECTACULUM are learned. Irregular are GRACILEM > *graille*, FRAGILEM > *fraile*, in which the CL (GL) seems to have developed (like CR > *ir*) > *il* (dental *l*);¹ *aigle* < AQUILAM belongs to a large class of words in which CL became *gl*, without developing further.²

Ē + palatal L: CONSĪLIUM > *conseil*, TĪLIAM > *teille*, MIRABĪLIAM > *merveille*; CORNĪCULAM > *corneille*, CORBĪCULAM > *corbeille*, OVĪCULAM > *oeille*, PARĪCULUM > *pareil*, AURĪCULAM > *oreille*, SOMNĪCULUM > *sommeil*, VERMĪCULUM > *vermeil*, ARTĪCULUM > *orteil*³; SĪTULAM > *seille*; RĒGULAM > *reille*.⁴ There are some irregularities to be mentioned here; irregular Ē + LJ developments we note as follows: COCHŸLIUM > *coquille*, *JUNCĪLIAM > *jonquille*, FAMĪLIAM > *famille*, SUPERCĪLIUM > *sourcil*, MĪLIUM > *mil*, TĪLIAM > *tille* (variant of *teille* given above), VITĪLIAM > *vetille*, EXĪLIUM > *eissil*, VOLATĪLIAM > *voletille*. Suchier attributes to the *i* of the syllable -IUM the power to retain the tonic *ī*;⁵ *eissil* may be influenced by the verb *essilier*.⁶ Irregular Ē + CL developments are the following: CRATĪCULAM > *graille*, UMBĪLICUM > *nombril*, VULPEĆULAM > *goupille*, CAVĪCULAM > *cheville*, LENTĪCULAM > *lentille*, VITĪCULAM > *vrille*.⁷ These exceptions, as well as those under Ē + LJ (above) are usually explained as due to

¹ For *graisle*, *fraisle*, cf. *Romania*, xv, 620; Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 478; Matzke, *Moul. L.*, p. 91.

² Cf. Gutheim, *Konson.-Assim.*, p. 58.

³ For the initial *o* of *orteil*, cf. *Arch. Glot. It.*, x, 270.

⁴ Cf. Gröber, *Arch. f. Lat. Lex.*, v, 235.

⁵ *Gram.*, p. 26.

⁶ Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 126.

⁷ For the *r* in *vrille*, cf. *Zt.f. Rom. Phil.*, I, 481; *Romania*, III, 160 and VI, 133.

interchange of suffix.¹ As variants of *oreille*, *corneille*, we find *orille*, *cornille*.² *Vericle* < VITRICULUM, and *ventricle* < VENTRICULUM are learned.

Q + palatal L: CQLEUM > *coil*; CONŮCULAM > *conoille*, FENŮCULUM > *fenoil*, GENŮCULUM > *genoil*, *RANŮCULUM > *grenoille*,³ PANŮCULUM > *panoil*, VERŮCULUM > *veroil*, CARBŮCULAM > *carboille*, COLŮCULAM > *quenoille*.

There are some remarks to be made on this section (A, E, Q + palatal L). It may be remembered that E and Q + *l mouillée* have already been given, in another section of this paper, as diphthongizing (> *ie*, *ue*⁴). It has been said that it is incorrect to separate the developments of A, E, Q from those of E, Q in this instance. I was of a similar opinion at one time, but I now believe that careful reasoning will show that it is impossible to treat the two sets of developments together. The fact that E and Q before *l mouillée* give one set of results (*-iel'*, *-uel'*) and A, E, Q another (*-al'*, *-el'*, *-ol'*) is not to be denied. In order to consider all the given vowels in the same category, it will have to be shown why, with the same (assumed) starting points, results are different; why, for example, A, E, Q do not become *e*, *oi*, *eu* before *l mouillée*, just as before simple oral consonants, while E and Q do become *ie*, *ue* before *l mouillée* as before other consonants.

The only reason, probably, that could be given for this difference would be the following: let it be supposed that before the date of our earliest monuments, the *i* before *l'* was pronounced (ex. *travai/l'*, *consei/l'*). Now we know that before the date of our first monuments A had become *e* and

¹ Cf. Cohn, *Suffixwandel*, pp. 152, 211 (-ICULAM for -ŮCULAM), p. 171 (-ICULUM for -ECULUM; here cf. Schuchardt, *Der Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins*, I, 286), p. 154 (-ILIAM for -ŮLIAM). Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 126, mentions a substitution of -ILIAM for -ICULAM, without, however, specifying the quantity of the *i* in either case.

² Cf. Suchier, *Gram.*, p. 26; Cohn, *Suffixwandel*, pp. 152, 229; Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 107.

³ For the initial *g*, cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 380.

⁴ Cf. I, 5, p. 314.

Æ, *ei*; but at this time the *a* and *e* of *travai/l'*, *consei/l'*, and the like, were part of diphthongs (*ai*, *ei*) and hence did not partake of this development, and when later (after the date of the first monuments) the *i* was absorbed by the *l'*, the *a* and *e* remained (*traval'*, *consel'*) because the law for their transformation $> e$, *ei* had already acted, and they (*a*, *e*) being the same as new sounds introduced into the language were not subject to phonetic laws which had acted before their introduction.

Such a statement, based on the supposed pronunciation of the *i* preceding the *l'*, would explain why *Λ* and *Æ* did not develop before the latter, but it is untenable for the reason that we have proof, based on no suppositions, that the *i* before *l'*, if it was ever pronounced, was absorbed several centuries before the date of our earliest monuments. This proof is furnished by the development of *Æ* and *Q* before *l'*; these vowels diphthongize in the sixth century.¹ If the *i* before *l'* had been pronounced at that time, the triphthongs *iei*, *uoi* ($> i$, *ui*) would have resulted, and *VECLUM*, *VQLJAM* would have given (*viei/l' >*) *vil'*, (*vuoi/l' e >*) *vuil'e* instead of *viel'*, *vuel'e*. Therefore the *i*, if it was ever pronounced, must have been absorbed before the sixth century, and could have had nothing to do with the non-development of *Λ* and *Æ* before *l'* [unless it might be supposed that the *i* was pronounced only after some of the vowels (not after *Æ* and *Q*); but this, again, would be contrary to the principle(?) of treating all the vowels together].

Such considerations have led me to believe that there is no possibility of connecting the development of *Λ*, *Æ*, *Q* before *l'* with that of *Æ* and *Q* in the same position. If this was the only instance in which the two sets of vowels differed in their development when occurring before the same consonant group, I should think that some method of treating them together before *l'* should be found. But it has already been seen that, in many cases before the same consonant groups, the two sets follow different lines of development.²

¹ Cf. Schuchardt, *Vokalismus*, I, 105.

² Cf. this paper, III, 1 and 2.

It is not to be questioned that the *i* before *l'* was pronounced in certain dialects, and that in some Old French monuments (notably the *Roland*) the assonance points to the use (occasional at least) of *ei* as a diphthong. In parts of the east of France the pronunciation of *conseil* was originally *consei/l*, which later became *consoi/l* [and similarly that of *travail* was *travai/l*, which became *travel'*¹ (in pronunciation)]. The fact that we do not find *consoil*, *travel'* in Ile-de-France texts indicates that in this district the *i* was a mere graphic sign, and there is probably no reason for supposing it ever to have been pronounced there, or that it had any influence on the development of the vowels preceding it; regardless of it *ɛ* and *ɔ* diphthongized before *l'* as in I, *A*, *ɛ* and *ɔ* remained as in II.

Having now investigated the development of all the vowels, we are prepared to endeavor to apply this investigation to the solution of the question of free and checked position. This study has convinced me that the most misleading feature of existing definitions of free and checked vowels lies in the statements that *all* the vowels are free or checked before certain consonants or in certain circumstances. In order to prove the correctness or clearness of such statements it will have to be demonstrated that *all* the vowels show the same comparative (or parallel) developments or non-development when free, and all the same when checked, whatever these terms imply. Under what conditions is the history of all the vowels similar? We have seen that all the vowels develop in I, 1, 2, *a*, *b*, 3, *a*, *b*; let us, for the moment, call these free vowels. All remain, or do not develop, in II; let us call these checked vowels. But *ɛ* and *ɔ* diphthongize also in cases where the other vowels do not show the free development, that is, in I, 4, 5, 6, III, 1. This fact at once destroys the possibility of claiming that *all* the vowels develop in the same way under similar circumstances and induces me to hazard the statement:

The development of a vowel depends not altogether on the phonetic elements immediately following the vowel, but also

¹ Cf. Matzke, *Moul. L.*, p. 69.

to a great extent upon the original character of the vowel itself. If this were not so, why should not $\text{A} > e$, $\text{Q} > eu$ before RJ, just as $\text{E} > ie$, $\text{Q} > ue$ before RJ? All four of these vowels did develop alike in some instances (for example, I, 1, 2, 3); if it was a similar phonetic element following the vowels in these cases that made them develop in a like manner, why should not RJ [using this only as an illustration] make them develop similarly in the present instance? The fact that E and Q diphthongize before *l mouillée* shows that their diphthongization (before any consonant + J combination) was not dependent on the anterior development of a palatal *i*; hence the *i* does not explain their development before RJ, any more than it explains the non-development of A , E and Q before the same combination,—all of which points to the supposition that there is something in the nature of the E and Q (lacking in the other vowels) which enables them to develop without regard to the consonant or consonants following them.

Why one vowel should manifest a tendency to develop in a way that another does not follow, or what constitutes the different “natures” of the vowels is a subject to be investigated by itself. The essential for the present paper to note is that E and Q develop not only in every instance in which the other vowels do, but in cases (notably before consonant + J combinations) where the others do not develop. This leads me again to hazard the question :

Were not E and Q free (that is, did they not develop) originally in every position in Gallic Popular Latin, regardless of the consonant groups following them? This condition (diphthongization in all circumstances) is still preserved in some northern French dialects and agrees with a similar diphthongization to be found in Spanish and in some southern Italian dialects. The two additional facts following seem to indicate the same original general diphthongization of E and Q for Ile-de-France territory too: First; we find in texts representing the language of this district a number of words which show *ie* to have developed out of E when the latter

stood before groups which generally constituted a check to its development. These words have furnished opportunity for much discussion,¹ but, if understood as remnants of the old universal diphthongization of the ɛ, they offer no further difficulty. The words are *pièce* < PĒTTIAM, *fierge* < FĒRREAM, *tierz* < TĒRTIUM, *nièce* < NĒPTIAM. Here we may include also *siège* < SĒDICAM, *piège* < PĒDICAM, *miège* < MĒDICUM, *tiède* < TĒPIDAM. As remnants of the old diphthongization of the ɔ before combinations supposed to constitute a check, I note: *repruece* < *REPRQPIUM, *tuertre* < TQRQUERE, *nueces* < NQPTIA, *juefne* < JQVENEM.²—Secondly; in studying the history of free tonic A, ɛ and ɔ we frequently meet exceptions to their usual development (> e, oi and eu) and have to seek for reasons for their remaining as if checked or developing only to a certain extent (cf. *car, mal, nous*); I have noticed no case, however, in which A, ɛ and ɔ develop before groups which ordinarily check their development. As we have just seen, we do find such cases for ɛ and ɔ (cf. *pièce*, etc., *repruece*, etc.),—which indicates again the tendency of ɛ and ɔ to develop under all circumstances, and the separation of their development from that of A, ɛ and ɔ.

Having suggested these two points, namely, that we cannot claim that any given combination necessarily affects all the vowels alike, but that the evolution of the latter depends to a great extent upon the nature of the vowel itself, and, in the second place, that ɛ and ɔ retain their original forms in so few instances that one is inclined to believe that they

¹ For which cf. the following: Bartsch et Horning, *La Langue*, etc., § 32; *Romania*, XVIII, 156; Schwan, *Gram.*, § 91, 2, anm. Suchier, *Gram.*, pp. 44 and 17, *Fr. et Prov.*, p. 148, *Grundriss*, I, 631; Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 158; Gröber in *Miscellanea di Filologia e Linguistica (In Memoria di Caix e Canello)*, p. 46, *Zt. f. Rom. Phil.*, XI, 287; Horning, *Lat.* c, p. 22; Ascoli, *Arch. Glot. It.*, x, 84.

² Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. d. lang. rom.*, I, 145; Schwan, *Gram.*, § 13; *Romania*, x, 398; *Arch. f. Lat. Lex.*, IV, 134; Suchier (see references in preceding foot-note).

developed (diphthongized) originally in all positions,—there remains another question to be answered.

How shall we consider the vowels occurring before palatals or palatal combinations? In my opinion this point offers no difficulty. Before some of these combinations certain vowels remain (CAVEAM > *cage*) just as they remain before other combinations; before some of them, again, certain vowels develop (PRETIUM > *prieis* > *pris*) just as before single consonants not palatals. When A, ɛ and ɔ occur before a palatal or palatal combination from which a palatal *i* develops, we have seen that there result the diphthongs *ai*, *ei* and *oi*. But here we are in the presence of a new set of products which have nothing in common with the original developments of A, ɛ and ɔ (that is, *e*, *oi*, *eu*) because the subsequent development of these secondary elements is that of *ai*, *ei*, *oi* as diphthongs, and not that of the vowels A, ɛ, ɔ, and hence these diphthongs are to be treated as separate products and apart from the original developments of the vowels. As an illustration of the statement that the development of these diphthongs (*ai*, *ei*, *oi*) is that of the diphthongs themselves as separate phonetic elements, I have only to recall the fact that the *oi* (< ɔ + palatal *i*), the *ei* (< ɛ + palatal *i*), the *oi* (< AU + palatal *i*), and the *oi* < free tonic ɛ all have the same development in pronunciation without reference to their origins. We may say that A is checked before vJ because it remains before this combination as it does before many others constituting checked position; we may say that ɛ is free before TJ because it develops before TJ as it does before a consonant not a palatal; when we come to *ai*, *ei*, *oi*, however, we find that there is nothing with which to compare them, for such combinations developed only when A, ɛ and ɔ preceded palatals,—hence they form at once a class to themselves.

Thus I reduce the terms “free” and “checked” so that I understand them to refer only to the spontaneous, primary development or non-development of the Popular Latin vowels in French. The primary development of the vowels is the

following: $A > e$, $E > ei > oi$, $E > ie$, $O > ou > eu$, $Q > uo > ue > eu$; wherever these results are shown in French I would call the corresponding Popular Latin equivalents "free" regardless of the consonant or consonant groups there following them. Where the Popular Latin vowels retain their original quality in French, I would call them "checked," likewise regardless of the consonants following them. Forming a secondary class to themselves and not included in the above are the diphthongs *ai*, *ei*, *oi* ($< A, E, O +$ palatals). A in *PACEM* certainly stood in free position, according to the old definition, in so far as it was followed by a single consonant; but the development of a palatal *i* and the immediate junction of the *a* with the *i* in the diphthong *ai* at once removed the A from the list of those cases wherein it becomes *e* as well as from those wherein it remains as *a*; in other words we have not a spontaneous development of the A as before consonants not palatals, but one dependent on the anterior development of the palatal. In this way I would not class A, E and O before palatals as either free or checked but would treat them separately.

The following scheme will exhibit in what circumstances a given Popular Latin vowel may be said to be free, in what checked, and the formation of the diphthongs *ai*, *ei*, *oi*; the justification for each division is based on the detailed study of these vowels made in the preceding pages, to which references are given for each development.

FREE. (I; III, 1).

- | | | |
|----------------|---|---|
| All the vowels | { | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Hiatus or final p. 309. 2. Followed by a single consonant (not a palatal or nasal) in monosyllables and polysyllables p. 310. 3. Followed by two consonants, first of which is not a palatal, nasal nor L or R, second of which is R or L . . . p. 310. |
|----------------|---|---|

- In addition ɛ and ɔ alone
- | | |
|---|--|
| { | 1. Followed by N or M p. 314. |
| | 2. Followed by single palatal, or palatal group, out of which |
| | <i>a.</i> a palatal i does not develop (LJ , VJ) p. 314. |
| | <i>b.</i> a palatal i does develop (CR , GR , TJ , DJ , NJ , RJ , SJ , GJ) pp. 315, 317. |

SECONDARY DEVELOPMENTS. (III, 2.)

- | | |
|-----|--|
| A { | $\text{A} > ai$. Before simple palatal or palatal group (CR , GR , TJ , DJ , GJ , RJ), p. 319. |
| | $\text{A} > \tilde{a}i$. Before simple nasal, and before n <i>mouillée</i>, p. 324. |
| ɛ { | $\text{ɛ} > ei (oi)$. Before simple palatal or palatal group (CR , GR , TJ , DJ , GJ , RJ , SJ), p. 321. |
| | $\text{ɛ} > \tilde{e}i$. Before simple nasal and before n <i>mouillée</i>, p. 324. |
| ɔ { | $\text{ɔ} > oi$. Before simple palatal or palatal group (RJ , TJ), p. 323. |
| | $\text{ɔ} > \tilde{o}i$. Before n <i>mouillée</i>, p. 324. |

CHECKED. (II; III, 3.)

All the vowels before combinations not specified under "Free" and "Secondary Developments", p. 315.

As \tilde{i} and \tilde{u} do not find a place in the above scheme, some remarks should be made on the manner of classifying them. Because they maintained their Popular Latin quality in French a study of them could be of no assistance in determining the principle of free and checked position. In so far as my use of "free" is synonymous with "development," and "checked" with "non-development," \tilde{i} and \tilde{u} do not develop, their "nature" being exactly the opposite of that of ɛ and ɔ ; the latter exhibit a tendency to develop before almost all combinations, the former to remain before all [\tilde{u} undergoing only the sec-

ondary development of a diphthong (like *ai*, *oi*) when united with a palatal *i*]. *ɪ* and *ʊ* are not checked then because of the combinations following them but simply show to a greater extent than *A*, *ɛ* and *ɔ* a tendency toward non-development. *ɛ* and *ɔ* develop in the greatest number of cases, *A*, *ɛ* and *ɔ* in a less number, *ɪ* and *ʊ* in the least, or rather in none at all.

Résumé.

“Free” and “checked,” if these terms are to be continued in use, do not mean that the vowel to which they are applied is freed or checked solely on account of a following consonant or consonant group; the vowel may be free (that is, it develops) or checked (that is, it does not develop) simply because it is such and such a vowel. Two elements, instead of one, are to be considered—the nature as well as the position of the vowel—the vowel developing or not of its own accord, as well as because a certain consonant follows it.

It is hoped that the characterization, in this paper, of the development of *A*, *ɛ* and *ɔ* before palatals as a secondary one (because dependent on the anterior development of the palatal, and because the *A*, *ɛ* and *ɔ* develop as diphthongs in conjunction with the palatal *i* and not independently) and the separation of this development from those cases in which the vowels develop independently,—it is hoped that this simplifies the entire question of free and checked position to a marked extent. With the exception of this variation (*ai*, *ei*, *oi*) the Popular Latin vowels either develop or remain in French. Hence we have only to apply the term “free” to those which develop, “checked” to those which remain.

The present study of French forms as starting points (and going back from these to their Popular Latin equivalents) has been the means of enabling us to obtain exact and comprehensive statements as to free and checked position. We have seen that these terms refer to development or non-development; before what combinations a vowel is free or

checked; that the vowels are to be grouped according to their tendency to develop as follows: *Ē* with *Q*, *A* with *Ē* and *Q*, *I* with *Ů*. By reference to the scheme given above the tonic vowels of Gallic Popular Latin words may at once be characterized as free or checked or developing as diphthongs. The details of the developments may be found readily by following the references given in the scheme to the preceding pages of the paper.

INDEX OF WORDS.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
<i>abaye</i>	320	<i>cable</i>	312
<i>aigle</i>	319, 325	<i>cadre</i>	311
<i>aigre</i>	319	<i>cage</i>	331
<i>ail</i>	325	<i>calais</i>	320
<i>ainçois</i>	322	<i>candelabre</i>	311
<i>aire</i>	321	<i>car</i>	310, 330
<i>alaigre</i>	319	<i>carboille</i>	326
<i>aligre</i>	315	<i>carquois</i>	321
<i>anceis</i>	322	<i>cèdre</i>	311
<i>ançois</i>	322	<i>celèbre</i>	311
<i>angoisse</i>	323	<i>cenail</i>	325
<i>ardoise</i>	321	<i>cerise</i>	316
<i>armin</i>	316	<i>cervoise</i>	321
<i>armoise</i>	321	<i>chaière</i>	310
<i>avoue</i>	313	<i>chantier</i>	321
<i>avouer</i>	313	<i>Charles</i>	310, 315
<i>aveugle</i>	311	<i>chemise</i>	321
<i>bai</i>	321	<i>chevez</i>	323
<i>bal</i>	319	<i>cheville</i>	325
<i>belais</i>	320	<i>chèvre</i>	310
<i>berb</i>	319	<i>ciboire</i>	323
<i>beurre</i>	311	<i>cire</i>	321
<i>bien</i>	314	<i>cirge</i>	321
<i>braie</i>	319	<i>cisoire</i>	323
<i>buen</i>	314	<i>clerc</i>	315

	PAGE.		PAGE.
<i>coil</i>	326	<i>dieus</i>	309
<i>cointe</i>	318	<i>dis</i>	315
<i>coldre</i>	310	<i>douaire</i>	321
<i>conoille</i>	326	<i>double</i>	311, 312, 313
<i>conseil</i>	325, 326, 327, 328	<i>doubler</i>	313
<i>consoil</i>	328	<i>dreit</i>	321
<i>conte</i>	315	<i>droit</i>	321
<i>convin</i>	316	<i>duist</i>	317
<i>convoitise</i>	322	<i>écritoire</i>	323
<i>coquille</i>	325	<i>écueil</i>	314
<i>corbeille</i>	325	<i>église</i>	316, 317
<i>corneille</i>	325, 326	<i>eissil</i>	325
<i>cornille</i>	326	<i>éloge</i>	317
<i>corroie</i>	321	<i>empire</i>	316
<i>couluevre</i>	311	<i>endeible</i>	311, 312
<i>couple</i>	311, 312, 313	<i>endieble</i>	312
<i>coupler</i>	313	<i>engieng</i>	316
<i>court</i>	315	<i>engin</i>	316
<i>croiz</i>	323	<i>enginz</i>	316
<i>cuens</i>	314	<i>ennui</i>	317
<i>cuér</i>	310	<i>enseigne</i>	324
<i>cuinte</i>	318	<i>ensouple</i>	312
<i>cuir</i>	318	<i>entir</i>	307
<i>cuisse</i>	317	<i>entire</i>	315
<i>deluevre</i>	324	<i>entrailles</i>	319
<i>déluge</i>	323	<i>entreilles</i>	319
<i>deluivre</i>	323	<i>envie</i>	322
<i>demi</i>	322	<i>épice</i>	317
<i>dépouille</i>	314	<i>épouser</i>	313
<i>dépouiller</i>	314	<i>époux</i>	313
<i>derrière</i>	310	<i>espoine</i>	318
<i>deu</i>	309	<i>essai</i>	321
<i>deuil</i>	314	<i>essilier</i>	325
<i>diable</i>	312	<i>essoigne</i>	318
<i>die</i>	310	<i>estas</i>	310

	PAGE.		PAGE.
<i>esteule</i>	313	<i>franchise</i>	322
<i>estouble</i>	313	<i>freis</i>	321
<i>estoule</i>	313	<i>frepe</i>	311
<i>estuide</i>	323	<i>froisset</i>	323
<i>estuire</i>	323	<i>Gallice</i>	317
<i>étale</i>	312	<i>genoil</i>	326
<i>êteule</i>	312	<i>Gilles</i>	322
<i>étude</i>	323	<i>Gire</i>	322
<i>évantail</i>	325	<i>glorie</i>	318
<i>fable</i>	312	<i>goupille</i>	325
<i>faire</i>	319	<i>gouvernail</i>	325
<i>famille</i>	325	<i>grace</i>	320
<i>feiz</i>	321	<i>graille</i>	325
<i>fenoil</i>	326	<i>graille</i>	325
<i>ferraille</i>	325	<i>graisle</i>	325
<i>feuille</i>	314	<i>grenaille</i>	326
<i>fèvre</i>	310	<i>Grice</i>	317
<i>fieble</i>	312	<i>gros</i>	315
<i>fierge</i>	330	<i>haire</i>	321
<i>fieu</i>	309	<i>histoire</i>	318
<i>fièvre</i>	310	<i>histoire</i>	318
<i>fleible</i>	311	<i>honeur</i>	310
<i>fleuve</i>	323	<i>horloge</i>	317
<i>flueve</i>	323	<i>hospice</i>	323
<i>fluive</i>	323	<i>huem</i>	314
<i>fluve</i>	323	<i>hui</i>	317
<i>fluvie</i>	323	<i>ieble</i>	311
<i>foible</i>	311, 312	<i>ja</i>	310
<i>foire</i>	318, 321	<i>jeunesse</i>	322
<i>fois</i>	321	<i>jonquille</i>	325
<i>foleie</i>	320	<i>jour</i>	315
<i>fondéfle</i>	312, 313	<i>juefne</i>	330
<i>forceis</i>	322	<i>justice</i>	322
<i>fraile</i>	325	<i>laisse</i>	319
<i>fraisle</i>	325	<i>largesse</i>	322

	PAGE.		PAGE.
<i>lentille</i>	325	<i>mieus</i>	309
<i>levre</i>	310	<i>mil</i>	325
<i>liege</i>	315	<i>milice</i>	322
<i>liepre</i>	310	<i>miracle</i>	325
<i>lierre</i>	310	<i>miroir</i>	323
<i>lit</i>	315	<i>misère</i>	316
<i>loin</i>	318	<i>modle</i>	314
<i>loire</i>	321	<i>moi</i>	310
<i>lois</i>	323	<i>moie</i>	309
<i>loutre</i>	311	<i>mois</i>	310
<i>lucre</i>	311	<i>mole</i>	314
<i>lugubre</i>	311	<i>molesse</i>	322
<i>luign</i>	318	<i>moule</i>	314
<i>luin</i>	318	<i>mousse</i>	323
<i>luinz</i>	318	<i>mueble</i>	313
<i>mace</i>	320	<i>muet</i>	313
<i>maigre</i>	307, 319	<i>muevent</i>	313
<i>mail</i>	325	<i>muid</i>	317
<i>main</i>	307, 324	<i>navire</i>	321
<i>mais</i>	319	<i>negoce</i>	323
<i>mal</i>	310, 330	<i>neuf</i>	310
<i>malves</i>	320	<i>nièce</i>	330
<i>martire</i>	321	<i>nieule</i>	311
<i>matire</i>	316	<i>noble</i>	313
<i>mauvais</i>	320	<i>noir</i>	321
<i>mel</i>	310	<i>nombril</i>	325
<i>mémoire</i>	318	<i>nous</i>	330
<i>memorie</i>	318	<i>novice</i>	323
<i>merveille</i>	325	<i>nueces</i>	330
<i>mestier</i>	316	<i>nuire</i>	317
<i>mezre</i>	311	<i>nuît</i>	317
<i>mi</i>	316	<i>oeille</i>	325
<i>miege</i>	330	<i>ombre</i>	315
<i>miel</i>	310	<i>oreille</i>	325, 326
<i>mien</i>	309	<i>orille</i>	326

	PAGE.		PAGE.
<i>orteil</i>	325	<i>pris</i>	307, 315, 331
<i>ouaiche</i>	321	<i>proeise</i>	322
<i>oür</i>	323	<i>provain</i>	324
<i>paille</i>	325	<i>pueble</i>	312
<i>pais</i>	332	<i>pueple</i>	311, 312
<i>palais</i>	307, 320	<i>pui</i>	317
<i>panoil</i>	326	<i>puis</i>	323
<i>pareil</i>	325	<i>puiser</i>	323
<i> paresse</i>	322	<i>puits</i>	323
<i>parole</i>	312	<i>pyrethre</i>	311
<i>paupière</i>	310	<i>quant</i>	315
<i>péage</i>	321	<i>quenoille</i>	326
<i>peignoir</i>	323	<i>quer</i>	310
<i>père</i>	310	<i>quia</i>	310
<i>perle</i>	310, 315	<i>ráble</i>	312
<i>peuple</i>	311, 312	<i>rai</i>	321
<i>pièce</i>	330	<i>raille</i>	325
<i>pied</i>	308, 310	<i>règle</i>	313
<i>piege</i>	330	<i>reille</i>	313, 325
<i>pierre</i>	310	<i>repruece</i>	330
<i>place</i>	320	<i>reule</i>	313
<i>plaie</i>	321	<i>richeise</i>	322
<i>plaire</i>	319	<i>rien</i>	310, 314
<i>plaisir</i>	319	<i>rieule</i>	313
<i>plein</i>	324	<i>rifugère</i>	316
<i>pluie</i>	324	<i>riule</i>	313
<i>poble</i>	312	<i>rodle</i>	314
<i>poign</i>	324	<i>role</i>	314
<i>poire</i>	318	<i>rui</i>	317
<i>poivre</i>	310	<i>ruile</i>	313
<i>police</i>	322	<i>sagittaire</i>	321
<i>porte</i>	315	<i>sarumure</i>	323
<i>préface</i>	320	<i>seille</i>	325
<i>presbytère</i>	321	<i>sept</i>	315
<i>prie</i>	315	<i>serail</i>	325

	PAGE.		PAGE.
<i>serorge</i>	323	<i>tierz</i>	330
<i>service</i>	323	<i>tieule</i>	313
<i>seue</i>	310	<i>tigre</i>	311
<i>siècle</i>	311	<i>tille</i>	325
<i>siège</i>	330	<i>tire</i>	321
<i>sire</i>	316	<i>tiule</i>	313
<i>sis</i>	315	<i>toi</i>	310
<i>sobre</i>	311	<i>tôle</i>	312
<i>soignier</i>	318	<i>traille</i>	325
<i>soin</i>	318	<i>traire</i>	319
<i>soit</i>	309	<i>travail</i> , 319, 325, 326,	
<i>sommeil</i>	325	327.....	328
<i>sordeis</i>	322	<i>traveil</i>	319
<i>sourcil</i>	325	<i>treble</i>	312
<i>souterrain</i>	324	<i>trente</i>	315
<i>spectacle</i>	325	<i>tres</i>	310
<i>strie</i>	310	<i>triège</i>	315
<i>suen</i>	314	<i>trifoire</i>	318
<i>surplus</i>	323	<i>tristesse</i>	322
<i>taire</i>	319	<i>trois</i>	310
<i>taisir</i>	319	<i>tuertre</i>	330
<i>tamis</i>	321	<i>tuile</i>	313
<i>taule</i>	312	<i>ueil</i>	314
<i>teigne</i>	324	<i>uile</i>	314
<i>teille</i>	325	<i>vair</i>	321
<i>tel</i>	307, 310	<i>val</i>	310, 315
<i>temoign</i>	324	<i>Venise</i>	316
<i>teniebres</i>	310	<i>vent</i>	315
<i>terre</i>	310, 315	<i>ventricle</i>	326
<i>terrible</i>	312	<i>vericle</i>	326
<i>teue</i>	309	<i>vermeil</i>	325
<i>teule</i>	313	<i>veroil</i>	326
<i>tezoire</i>	323	<i>vert</i>	315
<i>théâtre</i>	311	<i>vetille</i>	325
<i>tiède</i>	330	<i>vice</i>	323

	PAGE.		PAGE.
<i>vieil</i>	314, 327	<i>voiz</i>	323
<i>vieillesse</i>	322	<i>voilette</i>	325
<i>vienge</i>	316	<i>vrille</i>	325
<i>voie</i>	309	<i>vucille</i>	327
<i>voire</i>	310		

L. EMIL MENDER.